DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 057 158 UD 011 986

AUTHOR MacPhee, Barbara Campbell
TITLE Emergency School Assistance Program: Community Grants. A Preliminary Report.
INSTITUTION Southern Education Foundation, Atlanta, Ga.
PUB DATE Nov 71
NOTE 58p.
AVAILABLE FROM Southern Education Foundation, 811 Cyprus Street, N. E., Atlanta, Georgia 30308 (Free of Charge)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Community Programs; *Federal Aid; *Federal Programs; Nonprofessional Personnel; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; *School Integration
IDENTIFIERS Emergency School Assistance Program of 1970; ESAP

ABSTRACT

In September 1970, Congress launched a comprehensive program to make funds available directly to those school districts facing problems associated with school desegregation. The legislation was entitled the Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP) and took $75 million from previously authorized appropriations. Ten percent of the funds was reserved for programs applied for by public and private non-profit groups. Because of the importance of the community grant program's recognition of the role of non-professionals, the Southern Education Foundation decided to support a preliminary evaluation of the funded programs. This evaluation intends to describe a representative sample of the projects, and consider some questions about their activities in relation to the overall desegregation process. The writer of this report visited 18 projects, a sample of more than 10 percent of all projects funded. Staff and others were interviewed. A program overview and detailed evaluation constitutes the body of the report. (Author/JW)

ED057158

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Emergency School Assistance Program

Community Grants

A PRELIMINARY REPORT

Barbara Campbell MacPhee

UD011986

Prepared for
SOUTHERN EDUCATION FOUNDATION
811 Cypress Street, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30308
November, 1971

Editorial correspondence regarding this report can be addressed directly to:

Barbara Campbell MacPhee
P.O. Box 15677
New Orleans, Louisiana 70115

Additional copies can be ordered from:

Southern Education Foundation
811 Cypress Street N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction	1
II. Purpose and Method	5
III. Program Overview	7
A. Authorized Activities	7
B. Identification of Needs	7
C. Description of Programs	8
1. Community Information Programs	8
a. Large Type A Programs	8
b. Newsletters	10
c. Community Workers Supply Information	10
d. Advisory Councils as Conduits of Information	11
2. Technical Assistance Programs	13
3. Special Student Services	14
a. Tutorials	14
b. Self-Awareness	16
c. Promoting Understanding Among Students	16
d. Social Centers	19
4. Promoting Understanding Among Parents	19
5. Parent Leadership Training	21
IV. Evaluation	23
1. Use of Volunteers	24
2. Role of Students	28
3. Staffing Problems	29
4. Use of Professionals	30
5. Technical Assistance Needs	31
6. Proper Use of Federal Support	34
7. Relationships to Local Education Agencies	34
8. Office of Education Favoritism of LEA Programs	37
9. Affecting School Programs	38
V. Conclusions and Recommendations	39
Table of Projects Visited	26
Appendix A—Community Grant Projects Visited	45
Appendix B—Community Grant Projects Not Visited	47

FOREWORD

The Emergency School Assistance Program, which began in 1970, is one of the most important Federal support programs affecting Southern school desegregation and the many educational problems which are associated with it. The Southern Education Foundation maintains a central and continuing concern for such problems, and therefore asked Barbara Campbell MacPhee to conduct a preliminary review and evaluation of the "Community Grants" portion of the Program in its early stages. It is our hope that such a report will increase public knowledge of the operation and significance of this unique Federal commitment.

Mrs. MacPhee, who holds an M.A.T. from Harvard University, has had considerable experience closely related to problems of school desegregation. She directed the student teaching program of the Chapel Hill, North Carolina, school system for several years, working with the Federally funded Title IV program which eased the achievement of one of the earliest and most effectively implemented desegregation plans in a Southern school system. She also had management responsibility in several innovative teacher training programs which were financed by private funds in that city. From 1970 to 1971 she served as Program Coordinator for the Educational Resources Center on School Desegregation in New Orleans, a Federally funded university center to provide technical assistance to school administrators on school desegregation problems.

Mrs. MacPhee also had the advantage of discussing this report in several draft stages with Winifred Green of the American Friends Service Committee, with Ruby Martin and Cynthia Brown of the Washington Research Propect, with Rims Barber of the Delta Ministry, and with Virginia Frank, Washington representative of the Southern Education Foundation, all of whom made very helpful suggestions and comments.

To Mrs. MacPhee and to all those who have assisted in making this report possible, the Foundation wishes to express its appreciation.

John A. Griffin

Executive Director
Southern Education Foundation

I. INTRODUCTION

On September 1, 1970, the Congress of the United States launched a comprehensive program to make funds available directly to those school districts facing problems associated with school desegregation. The call for this legislation came from President Nixon, who recognized the help needed by a large number of school districts in the South whose terminal desegregation plans would be completed in the fall of the 1970-71 school year.[1]

The legislation was entitled the Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP) and took $75 million from previously authorized appropriations such as the Education Professions Development Act, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title IV), the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and its amendments of 1967, and the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Title II). The purpose of the money was:

> . . . to meet special needs incident to the elimination of racial segregation and discrimination among students and faculty in elementary and secondary schools by contributing to the costs of new or expanded activities to be carried out by the local educational agencies *or other agencies, organizations or institutions* . . .[2] (writer's own emphasis)

This new program was to be administered by the Office of Education, and administrative decisions were immediately made to implement the program. The first significant, and somewhat historic, decision was that 10 percent of the funds, or about $7 million, would be reserved for programs applied for by public and private non-profit groups. The remaining amount, 90 percent of the funds, was for local education agencies (LEAs).

Many private community groups, either volunteer or funded from non-governmental agencies, had been working on problems related to school desegregation for years, bringing the critical

legal issues to the courts, supporting students who first crossed racial lines, organizing parents and community leaders into discussion groups, and monitoring the actions of local school boards and officials as well as public policy.

The precedent for Federal support of community involvement had been set through the Office of Economic Opportunity's Poverty Programs. But this critical decision to reserve "community grant" funds was the first official recognition of the role of such groups in educational problem-solving.

Having made this decision, however, the Office of Education (OE) then decided to give its full attention to funding applications from school districts eligible for 90 percent of the funds. This program was administered through the Division of Equal Educational Opportunities already responsible for making grants under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

In early September of 1970 meetings were held at which regional and local Title IV personnel rendered direct, immediate assistance to local education agency representatives in writing fundable proposals. All local education agencies (LEAs) were invited to send representatives; expenses incurred by participants were paid by Title IV. (Community representatives seeking information on the ESAP bill were not formally invited, although some did attend.) Next, those LEA proposals were reviewed through the regional Title IV staffs.

Nearly all of the 90 percent funds were committed before the government even began to organize the community grant program. In its haste to fund the 90 percent program, the government permitted many civil rights violations and many violations of the intent and regulations of the program. These violations have been documented in a report by civil rights groups issued in November, 1970,[3] and in a report of the Comptroller General of the United States to the Congress in March, 1971.[4]

In the meantime, at least in part because officials of Title IV at national and regional levels were not sympathetic to the reservation of funds for community groups, the administration of that program was separated from the Office of Education. It was at first located in the Center for Community Planning in the Office of the Secretary of HEW, a group generally friendly to the concept of the program but inexperienced in funding administration and unfamiliar with the broad process of school desegregation. Eventually, a new Community Groups ESAP Office was established in the Office of Education, and a new director given authority over the program.

Program Implementation

In October, 1970 (by which time many LEA applicants were already being funded), the Community Groups ESAP Office sponsored informational conferences in Atlanta and Dallas for repre-

sentatives of community agencies, also called non-local education agencies (non-LEAs), from all parts of the South. Expenses for representatives' participation were paid by OE. At these conferences application forms and instructional handbooks were distributed and an orientation program was held on how the program would operate. Those who attended were the main, although not exclusive, source of proposals eventually funded.

Applications were submitted to meet a November 30th deadline and the process of review began. Considerable confusion then followed in the administrative review procedures. The role of State Advisory Committees on School Desegregation (appointed by President Nixon in 1970 to advise and assist him in this area) was never clearly stated. In practice, members were sometimes asked to comment on proposals although no provision for this appears in the regulations.[5] The role of state education agencies in approving community proposals was vague and without uniform practice from state to state. The importance of approvals from governors' offices was determined by the fact that some of the funds in these programs derive from Office of Economic Opportunity legislation, which requires this approval. (Governors in two states eventually vetoed some or all of the community projects in their states.) The regulation requiring comments and criticisms from the school district administrations about the local community projects was a source of great concern, since LEA-ESAP programs were not subject to a similar scrutiny by the community (except after the fact by bi-racial advisory committees).

Panels to review and judge applications were eventually established from staff within the Office of Education itself, rather than through groups of representative and knowledgeable individuals in the regions, and the evaluation of applications was done by criteria which were never publicly announced.

Before the October conferences it had been determined that there would be two categories of non-LEA grants. Type A proposals were to be few in number and designed to affect more than one school district. Type B proposals, more numerous but smaller in budget and scope, were to be designed to meet specific problems within a single school district. Some attempt was made to encourage specific kinds of programs within each category, such as programs dealing directly with students.

But administrative lack of clarity, purpose and experience resulted in a long and frustrating delay for project applicants. Despite the November deadline, the first community group funds were actually received by projects in March, 1971. Many non-LEA grantees were not funded until April or May, in contrast to the response to school district applications, which was as swift as two or three days in some cases.

All of the programs funded by the first year's allocation are now in operation, however, and this report deals with the first few months of their activities from March through September of 1971.

The Second Year of ESA Program

In the summer of 1971 some additional events took place with respect to the Emergency School Assistance Program. While the programmatic results cannot be dealt with in this report, it is important to note the events because they bear on any evaluation of the program.

The original impetus for the ESA program came from a Presidential request for $1.5 billion to spend on school desegregation problems. The Congress could not reconcile a variety of differences and controversies about that proposed legislation, and so the $75 million appropriated in August, 1970, was a temporary compromise for one year only.

The emergency school assistance measure is still under consideration in Congress. In the meantime, however, Congress has approved resolutions continuing programs funded under fiscal 1971 appropriations measures—acts which expired on June 30, 1971. These "continuing resolutions" have had the effect of continuing in the current fiscal year a level of funding for ESAP at the level of fiscal 1971—$62.5 million in the first three months of fiscal 1972.

Thus a new reservation of about $6 million for community grants was established, and although a considerable departmental reorganization took place, no changes in program implementation were announced on the basis of published evaluation. This gives added importance to our preliminary evaluation. Whether the new programs, or renewals of first year grants, will follow the same pattern as before is not yet known.

II. PURPOSE AND METHOD

Because of the importance of the community grant program's recognition of the role of non-professionals, the Southern Education Foundation decided to support a preliminary evaluation of the funded programs during August and September of 1971. The purpose of this evaluation is to describe a representative sample of the projects, and consider some questions about their activities in relation to the overall desegregation process.

The writer visited 18 projects, a sample of more than 10 percent of all projects funded. Programs selected for site visits were those which met the practical considerations of geographic convenience and programs in operation. Also, an effort was made to select a variety of program types. A table of the projects evaluated appears on pages 32-33.

Each project was visited by the writer at least once; ten were visited more than once, some as often as five times. In all cases, the staff directing the program was interviewed. Other persons were contacted for their assessment of the program, including school administrators, parents of children affected by the program, students, and observers such as local newspaper editors and fellow non-LEA grantees. The writer attended a few advisory board meetings and some of the working sessions of projects.

The report which follows is necessarily a subjective reaction. Since many programs deal with qualities which are difficult to measure, such as human understanding, formal surveys and controlled measurements of change are difficult and certainly not feasible in a report of this scope. This subjectivity of course has its dangers. If the reporter is inclined to believe that community groups have an important contribution to make, it may be easier to look past shortcomings and respond positively to program potentials and present strengths. If, however, a reporter believes the problems can only be solved by professionals in formal classroom or otherwise controlled settings, then the often stumbling

efforts of non-professionals may be viewed as an inappropriate use of Federal money. The writer recognizes a bias in favor of the first view, although every effort has been made for balance and honesty.

Another problem of evaluation is the short time in which the programs have been in operation. Many of them were started only recently and cannot be judged in any permanent sense on their initial steps. But the questions which this report attempts to answer remain important ones:

1. What assessment have community groups made of their needs and of programs which are within their competence?
2. How are they designing programs to meet those needs?
3. What kind of persons run the community grant projects? Who are "The Community"? Are they participating in the "meaningful . . . day to day implementation and direction of the program"?[6]
4. What problems have the community groups faced, and how have they resolved them?
5. What kind of cooperation or lack of it have these groups achieved with local education agencies? How have they affected school district programs in the community they both serve?

III. PROGRAM OVERVIEW

A. Authorized Activities

Community groups were eligible to apply for programs designed to deal with a wide variety of activities. Some of the authorized activities described in the ESAP handbook included promoting understanding among students and parents, conducting community information programs, providing remedial services, carrying out special curriculum revision programs and assisting parent and teachers groups to develop interracial understanding.[7] The reader should note that ten of the eighteen projects visited provide remedial services, though seven of these ten projects also have a variety of other programs operating under the same ESAP grant.

B. Identification of Needs

Each applicant was required to set out the needs it hoped to meet in its program. The needs identified in the eighteen projects visited have been categorized for this report into these areas:

- Community Information
- Technical Assistance
- Special Student Activities
- Promoting Understanding Among Parents
- Parent Leadership Training

There is among grantees some overlap in categories since several program have more than one facet. Nine groups chose to direct their efforts toward improving the amount and quality of information now available to the community to facilitate solving problems in their desegregated schools. Ten groups chose to provide special student services, particularly individualized in-

struction (tutorials) and counseling. Three groups chose to work on promoting understanding among students of all races and among parents.

C. Description of Programs

1. Community Information Programs

a. Large Type A Programs

The **Public Affairs Research Council of Baton Rouge, Louisiana,** is funded as a Type A program to publish a monthly newsletter emphasizing the positive outcomes of present desegregation and raising issues relevant to improving education generally in Louisiana. Its mailing list of 11,000 includes all Louisiana public school superintendents (66), all Louisiana public and private school principals (1,887) as well as members of PAR and other civic-minded organizations in the state such as the NAACP and the Louisiana Council on Human Relations. Every Louisiana lawmaker in the state and Federal government (154) receives a copy, as well as all the faculty members (650) of Louisiana's many colleges of education. PAR is already well-known in the state and enjoys an impeccable reputation for excellence in research.

The first issue of the newsletter, a highly professional, attractively designed publication, appeared in July. The lead article was a review of the debate over use of the National Teachers Examination (NTE) in hiring practices. This is a particularly controversial issue in Louisiana, where 19 percent of the school systems require the use of the NTE. This is the highest percentage of required usage in the nation.[8] The Louisiana Education Association (a predominantly black professional organization and the only one recognized in Louisiana by the National Education Association) has strongly denounced its use as discriminatory.

The second and most recent issue of the PAR newsletter was heavily laden with tables and statistics on the "dramatic and substantial gains in public school desegregation."[9] This issue exemplified the policy of the newsletter as set forth in their proposal: to inform the public of the successes of school desegregation. "We're not going to preach to whites," said editor Bill McMahon. "One has to set examples that speak for themselves."

Other aspects of the PAR program include using its long-developed skill and well-known name to produce frequent television news releases of one to two minutes duration. These news releases have featured PAR's Director Ed Steimel in interviews on the material covered in the newsletter. The two largest newspapers in the state (*The Times-Picayune* and *The States-Item,* both New Orleans newspapers) have written editorials praising the PAR-ESAP newsletters.

PAR also plans eight regional conferences for Title I advisory board members, LEA-ESAP advisory board members and other representatives of the community. While none has taken place at the time of this writing, the director expects these conferences to provide a forum for exchange of information on problems that have been solved and ones that remain, first-hand information for future PAR newsletters, and an opportunity to explain PAR's goals.

Another TYPE A project which will affect thousands of community people is **Texans for Educational Improvement of Mexican Americans (TEAM),** a community information program of parent education entirely operated by Chicanos for Chicanos. According to the OE Community Grant Handbook, "Even though the basic intent of the Program is to provide inter-racial opportunities . . . it is recognized that there are circumstances justifying the funding of programs with a particular ethnic target group."[10]

Because its budget of $293,684 must serve such a large area, TEAM Director Raymond Sanchez selected twelve counties approved by HEW in which to set up barrios consejos (neighborhood councils). The ESAP legislation is based on helping those districts with terminal desegregation plans under Title VI, which are those identified as de jure segregation problems. Thus there is no legal basis for using community grant program funds in some districts with Chicano/Anglo racial isolation problems. This means that many districts which have the greatest need for help, in terms of school failure (in the counties in the Rio Grande Valley which have the highest concentration of Mexican American pupils),[11] are not within the reach of TEAM's ESAP program. Understandably this remains a grave concern to the TEAM staff, who see it as another example of the remarkably low incidence of Federal assistance to Mexican Americans.[12]

It is through the consejos in the selected counties that TEAM will design parent workshops aimed at whatever problems are identified by the community. Sanchez anticipates, to cite one example, informational programs on school boards and how they function. (Ten percent of school board members in Texas are Chicano despite the fact that the student population is 22 percent Chicano.)[13]

In addition to this, TEAM has begun publication of its newsletter, which goes to all barrio citizens in the selected counties. The first issue contained useful articles, written in both Spanish and English, on such topics as: a synopsis of the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights findings on Mexican American discrimination, some historical articles about past leaders (prominent Mexican Americans in state and national government positions), current legal information on migrant workers' protection under the law, and news on TEAM activities in each barrio. The assumption implicit in this type of newsletter is that parents who are informed about their rights as citizens, their ethnic history, different models of

education and current educational trends are more likely to feel confident enough to participate in the schools. Uninformed parents who view the school as alien territory rarely serve on committees working to improve the schools.

As a part of that parent education-community information program, TEAM is building an extensive library of literature relevant to Mexican Americans. It is already the most thorough in the state. As school systems increase their awareness of the need for multi-ethnic materials, TEAM staff members will be in a position to recommend curriculum sources. If parents become aware of multi-ethnic materials through newsletter reviews and the library's loaning system, they will be in a position to increase school systems' awareness of the need for such materials.

b. Newsletters

Programs with small budgets rely heavily on hand-delivered mimeographed newsletters to inform their public. The tutorial program in **Abbeyville, Louisiana,** uses its newsletter as a student learning experience since students write most of the articles, poems and short stories. It is also a way continually to inform the community about what its ESAP tutorial is doing and what opportunities it is making available.

ACT Education Program in Mobile, Alabama, uses mimeographed leaflets to inform its community of the free movies which it sets up in the streets of various neighborhoods (movies such as "KING: Montgomery to Memphis") or to advertise the free black history course offered to the public. Its tutorial and kindergarten programs receive publicity through these handouts. It also publishes a general, more detailed newsletter about the program's activities. It mails this to a large number of civic leaders and interested citizens. A weekly television program (see also page 25) offers the greatest potential for breadth of community information along with the frequent letters to the editor and articles continually submitted by the ACT staff to newspapers.

c. Community Workers Supply Information

The **Tri-County Community Center's Program** operates in Rankin County, Mississippi. (Tri-County Community Center is the parent grantee. Its other programs operate in two neighboring counties as well as Rankin.) This project's method of information dissemination is the community worker. Four of them work within the county, organizing parent councils, facilitating discussions and arranging for speakers to address parent councils on issues they identify as problems in their section of the county.

The **Educational Resources Center (ERC)** has five community workers operating throughout the state of Mississippi. In this case, each is assigned a different category of the community population:

teachers, students and parents. By organizing conferences—such as its recent student rights conference or the school board legal responsibilities workshop—ERC staff provides information on critical issues to different segments of the community on a statewide basis.

d. Advisory Councils as Conduits of Information

Another method of informing the community is the use of the advisory board. Because of the membership of the boards and the boards' involvement in program operation, they provide information to the community in a unique way. Three projects which use this method well are: The Bogalusa Voters League of Bogalusa, Louisiana, the Mexican American Education Council (MAEC) of Houston, Texas, and the Hancock-Glascock County Project in middle Georgia.

In the **Bogalusa** program, an unusual coalition of black and white adults (not all, but many of whom are parents of school-age children) came together in the wake of national news-making "riots" at the opening of the high school in September, 1970, the second year of court-ordered, non-freedom-of-choice desegregation. This coalition played an active role in writing the grant and became the advisory board for the community (non-LEA) ESAP proposal submitted in the name of the Bogalusa Voters League, a black civil rights activist organization. The advent of the non-LEA Federal funds lent support to a promising, broadly-based community group.

Members of this Bogalusa Advisory Committee include a prominent civil rights leader who is known to many in the community as "the black mayor"; the president of the more moderate, though active NAACP; a white Baptist minister whose participation in the coalition provoked pressure against him from his more traditional congregation members; and a long-established white teacher who took a bold leadership role by starting the only bi-racial extra-curricular activity other than the band and football team. Four of the students from this bi-racial service club also serve on the advisory board. Another on the board is the wife of the resident manager of the town's largest employer: Crown-Zellerbach Paper Mills. She has taken an active leadership role in the coalition advisory board despite the expected "hands-off-local-politics" attitude often taken by those closely associated with national companies. The town's leading civil rights lawyer often played a pivotal role, although because of poor health he did not serve on the committee.

His sudden, recent death will sorely test the cohesiveness achieved by the group. His wife remains on the board, actively working for the success of the program. Though several of the board members are professional educators (such as the only black high school guidance counselor, an outspoken woman highly

regarded by white and black students alike; and the presidents of the local black and white teachers associations), many are non-educators (such as the parent of the plaintiff in the court case which desegregated the Bogalusa public schools, laborers from the plant, and the chief of police).

Because of the Bogalusa Voters League's ESAP proposal, this unusual group had an opportunity to work together, under equitable conditions brought about by mutual concerns, on a positive, sustained basis. As the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders noted, ". . . it is often easier to organize groups to oppose, complain, demonstrate and boycott than to develop and run programs."[14] This Bogalusa group, through the opportunity provided by ESAP, moved from the former to the latter category.

The advisory board for Houston's **Mexican American Education Council (MAEC)** ESA program is composed chiefly of persons elected by the nine "barrios" (or neighborhoods) served by MAEC. Most of the members are non-professional. Many have never been active in matters related to public education and decision making. Attendance at one of the MAEC-ESAP advisory council meetings is a lesson in involvement from the grassroots level. With great care and honesty, ESAP Director Cisneros and ESAP Coordinator Reyes seek approval and advice on matters related to program, staff, budget, and community concerns. There is no evidence of personal empire building here, but rather a strong commitment to facilitating experience for community people in those decision-making areas which govern their lives and the education of their children.

Hancock-Glascock Counties' ESAP advisory board plays a more operational role than most advisory boards of the projects visited. The entire board is made up of local, non-professional people, and their active participation in deciding how to run the program carries over into the community. For example, the decision was made to send a member of the advisory board rather than a staff member to a recent Atlanta University Technical Assistance Team workshop to learn about use of media. Upon his return, he taught other board members and the staff. Since the project's director does not live in either county it makes more sense to educate someone who is remaining in the community and whose knowledge can be used for future community-based programs. That is, when ESAP has come and gone in these two poverty-ridden counties, there will remain local citizens who have learned more about how to organize and operate a community program.

In the Desire Street Housing Project in New Orleans, the **Sons of Desire ESAP Tutorial Program** has an advisory board of which 75 percent is made up of parents of the children affected by the program. Though members of the staff and professionals

716

from local agencies (such as Tulane University) also sit on the board, it is the parent members who are responsible for informing the community and informing the board on the needs of that community.

The **McComb, Mississippi, Community Center Tutorial Program** also has an advisory board made up of parents and students. Several members also serve on the LEA-ESAP advisory board and thus facilitate communication among various elements in the community. One of the professional members of the board is a local reporter for the *Enterprise Journal* and has written feature stories about the program which reach most homes in the McComb area and beyond.

2. Technical Assistance Programs

Atlanta University, aside from being the "parent" to several ESAP community grants in Georgia, has its own ESAP grant to provide technical assistance to non-LEA (community) grantees in the state. Its Technical Assistance Team (TAT) relies heavily on professionals, particularly college professors, to assist community-based grantees. The individual grantee may request specific assistance from the TAT office in Atlanta, in which case a member of the team is dispatched to the program site at no expense to the grantee. The team member is paid $50 per day from the Atlanta University ESAP grant. TAT also sponsors periodic workshops on topics identified by the grantees as troublesome. The author attended one such workshop in mid-September; the subject of the meeting was effective use of the media.

Also as an aid to the community grantees throughout the state, TAT publishes a small newsletter which offers suggestions on useful resource materials (such as movie and book reviews), news of fellow grantees within the state and any current OE policy information which they need to know. Grantees are encouraged to send in information about their programs and to request specific assistance whenever necessary.

In two cases, the writer was impressed with the high quality of assistance rendered through this grantee: practical instruction in the use of media and details of operating an expenditure-accounting system. In at least one other instance, however, the writer was told by local staff that they knew more about the problem they were facing than the professional TAT member who was sent to assist them. Assembling a team of either non-professionals or professionals with answers to the broad spectrum of problems encountered by grantees is extremely difficult. This writer's only quarrel is with those who tend to assume that the professional person, usually a Ph.D., has *ipso facto* expertise in an area relevant to the local community of which he often is not a part.

3. *Special Student Services*

a. Tutorials

As stated in the opening of this overview (Identification of Needs) ten groups selected as crucial the need for services which students were not receiving from the public schools. Those services include: individualized instruction for students with learning problems; counseling for potential drop-outs, chronically suspended students, and students with other school problems; instruction in ethnic history; and personal counseling to improve students' self-awareness and confidence.

It would be easy enough to document high drop-out rates, frequency of absenteeism and other manifestations of educational neglect for Black Americans. Less well known are data on the Mexican Americans' educational problems.

In his testimony before the Mondale Equal Educational Opportunity Committee, Dr. David Sanchez of San Antonio, Texas, cited these facts about Spanish-speaking students: "In 1968, studies such as the NEA's projected 50 percent of Spanish-speaking children would drop out of school by the age of 16. Today, the drop-out rate is even more acute—60 to 70 percent (on a national scale) in high schools with large numbers of Spanish-speaking students."[15] These figures have particular meaning for Texas, since among the five southwestern states with significant Spanish-speaking populations, "isolation (by race) is most pronounced in Texas . . ."[16] where "70 percent of all elementary Mexican-American pupils are in predominantly Mexican-American schools . . ."[17]

Further damning evidence on the subject of Texas and its Chicano citizens is found in the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights Report: ". . . even though Texas has a compulsory attendance law, the usual board policy in most districts was not to enforce the attendance of Mexican-American children, particularly when this meant large numbers of them would attend school with Anglos."[18]

The Mexican American Education Council ESAP in Houston, Texas, has designed a program with very simple, explicit goals: (1) counseling and tutoring of students still in school, to keep them there, (2) counseling and tutoring of recent drop-outs to encourage re-entry into school, (3) tutoring for students who have been out of school a long time to assist them in passing the General Educational Development (GED) examination. This is an enormous task in Houston, where the high-employment economy attracts disenchanted, unmotivated students to drop out and get a low-level job. Even conservative estimates put the Houston drop-out rate at 80 percent. MAEC estimates that it was closer to 90 percent prior to initiating the tutorial/counseling program.

Testimony before the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity cites the very low percentage of Chicano

college graduates, which, in turn, affects the low number of Chicano professionals in education, on both the teaching and administrative levels.[19] By applying pressure to nearby University of Houston and Texas Southern University, and by thorough research into financial aid programs, MAEC-ESAP has doubled the number of Houston Chicano students in those two colleges this fall. Still, MAEC staff members are dissatisfied since the percentage increase is merely from one percent to two, or about 82 freshmen who would not have gone to college without the MAEC program. MAEC staff has arranged for an alliance with Texas Southern University for its Chicano freshmen to participate in a "Special Services Project . . . especially designed for (part-time and full-time) students who require services and innovative curriculums to insure their success in the academic environment."[20] It also has provided information through its counseling service about Texas Southern University's co-op plan which is attractive to Chicano students who must arrange for their own financial support.

Recognizing all the levels of the problem, MAEC-ESAP has applied pressure to Houston Independent School District (HISD) officials to hire more Chicano teachers and promote more Chicanos to administrative positions. In 1970, HISD had 143 Mexican American teachers and 3 principals. When school opened in 1971, more than 300 Mexican Americans were teaching and 8 Mexican Americans were school principals.

Houston school officials are sensitive to questions about why these changes and services must be initiated by agencies other than the public schools. They claim they already have been doing what MAEC-ESAP is doing. However MAEC-ESAP accomplishments suggest that this is not true. MAEC-ESAP is an excellent example of a private, non-profit organization which is capable of "more effectively carry(ing) out the purposes of the (ESAP) program. . . ."[21]

Other LEAs are sensitive to the criticism that the existence of a paraprofessional tutorial program implies. In the **Bogalusa** case, only after the community group (non-LEA) had applied for funds to run a tutoring center did the LEA apply to ESAP for a tutorial program. Apparently the Title IV officer assigned to Bogalusa pressured school officials into adding a tutorial program (they already had an ESAP grant for a vocational education program). The argument was that since a community group had identified this as *the* critical need, then professional educators ought to take heed and act accordingly. Consequently, there are two tutorial programs in Bogalusa, one operating totally with volunteer tutors and the other (the LEA) with paid tutors.

In the **Metter, Georgia,** tutorial program, the superintendent's absolute refusal to cooperate, either through meeting with the director or through loaning unused materials, can be seen as a

defensive reaction to the community's implied statement that their children are not being taught by the professional getting paid to teach. The community decided it would have to take on the task.

b. Self-Awareness

If the design of a significant portion of the non-LEA ESAP grants is any indication, many minority group members of communities in transition to fully desegregated schools feel a keen sense of personal identity loss. As one of the Educational Resources Center staff (in Mississippi) said when describing its Community Cultural Workshops: "Knowing that our children are entering a . . . new environment, I feel that it is our duty to provide some sort of avenue whereby they will not forget from where they came and how that past relates directly to the future they are about to embark on. It is important for any people to know and understand not only the culture of the ruling elite, but the culture of their own."

Because Black and Chicano students are not receiving sufficient (if any) education in their ethnic background, and because community people regard this as a serious deficit in these days of increased ethnic pride, several of the non-LEA tutorial programs include explicit and implicit ethnic information.

ACT Education Program in Mobile offered a black history course to the public free of tuition. **Candler County (Metter, Georgia)** had a summer arts and crafts program in which the children were taught about African customs, music and art. **McComb, Mississippi,** Community Center's summer tutorial program responded to the students' request by devoting one day per week to black history and group sessions in which students discussed their school-related and personal concerns. **Sons of Desire** Director George Price has gathered an impressive collection of multi-ethnic teaching materials such as the low-cost, consumable black history books written in comic book style. These were very well-received by the children; they made available in a readable form information about black heroes and leaders which are rarely found in their public school texts.

c. Promoting Understanding Among Students

It might have been expected that more community groups would have chosen to work on the problems of student relations. Although it is not at all uncommon for high schools in any of the areas visited to have been closed due to "rioting" or fights between Blacks and whites, very few non-LEA (or, for that matter, LEA) grantees chose to design programs to promote better understanding among students of all races.

Two programs working directly with students in matters of improved understanding are the Thibodaux, Louisiana, Southern Mutual Help Association (SMHA) program and the program of the

US 20

Mississippi State Association of Student Councils, which is the result of the marriage of the two formerly segregated student council organizations in the state.

Although black students make up only 12 percent of Thibodaux High School's student population and the parish in which it is located (Lafourche), Thibodaux High has been closed a number of times over the past two years due to racial disturbances. The **Southern Mutual Help Association** proposal, therefore, seems to be particularly appropriate: a youth "leadership training program to promote better race relations among" students of both races.[22] Because of opposition from the school superintendent and employee problems, the program had not begun at the time of site visits for this report. However, the plan is to hold one weekend (Saturday morning to Sunday afternoon) workshop per month for four months, each involving 20 students (10 black and 10 white) and 6 parent chaperones as well as SMHA-trained group discussion leaders.

The format for the weekend will be small group rap sessions interspersed with informal recreational activities. Meals and lodging will be provided. Through this effort of communication the participants will gain an "appreciative insight into their cultural differences and . . . begin to see each other as individuals and not stereotypes."[23]

This is one of the many programs which was handicapped by several months of waiting to receive word on ESAP funding. While the Thibodaux group met the November 30 deadline for applications, it did not receive funds until late April, with little more than a month of the school year remaining in which to establish an office, hire its small staff and make contacts with the LEA administration to secure permission to approach the student body through the school. Understandably, this was a blow to the operation of the program, though it certainly has not diminished the efforts or abilities of the program's perceptive director, Mr. Forest Reubin. He has worked methodically throughout the summer to win support of the school board (reluctant to endorse a program which has been denounced by Lafourche Parish superintendent as "racial mixing of the sexes") and to work around the policy refusing him or any of his staff access to the high school campus. Plans for the first workshop in October at a nearby conference center have moved ahead.

Another explicit effort for bi-racial student harmony is the **Mississippi State Association of Student Councils** merger proposal which was the outgrowth of the efforts of a former Jackson, Mississippi, school superintendent and the advisors to each of the once-segregated student council associations. This proposal called for a series of six regional, one-day workshops, each involving approximately 500 participants, including student leaders, student council members and faculty advisors. "These workshops

will provide students and adults with an opportunity for problem-solving and extensive communication."[24]

At the time of this writing, all six conferences have been held, although the final attendance total (500) was considerably smaller than expected. Program leaders explained that the conferences had been scheduled for early in the school year before many schools had held their student government elections. To compensate for this low number of students reached, and to provide a follow-up for those who attended the first series, they are considering spring workshops.

The writer attended one of the October meetings. One hundred forty-six students participated, the vast majority of whom were black. The format followed at this workshop was essentially the same for each of the others. After greetings and remarks from past student council officers (present college students) and the host college representative, the director of the project outlined the purposes of the workshop. He then introduced the speaker, a college professor from Arkansas who raised many critical issues on "The Role of Student Councils in Desegregated Schools." The students were then divided into small groups for discussions led by adults on topics such as "Elections in Desegregated Schools," "Social Events, Dress and Grooming."

To quote the keynote speaker at this workshop, the value of these workshops is largely dependent upon the "real authority—the participation in real, meaningful decisions" that student councils represented at these meetings have.

> "All too often, the council has been a plum for the conformist, unrepresentative of the student body as a whole, and up to its collective ears in trivia instead of real student concerns. It has traditionally enjoyed little in the way of positive programs, and even less in the way of power to change things. But many forward-looking educators, as mentioned earlier, see an important new function for the student council as a channel for student grievances and dissatisfaction. For one thing, they believe that student council must narrow its credibility gap and lack of communication with student militants who are largely outside of its circle."[25]

The total effect of even 500 Mississippi high school and junior high students meeting to listen to adults and students talk about problems without a clear plan of action and without the knowledge that they have the elected power to affect these problems is seriously questionable. In none of the small group discussions did the author hear the views expressed of either black or white militants. Even if these students were not attending, their point of view ought to have been discussed as well as the whole issue

of what responsibilities student councils have to establish communication with those students.

d. Social Centers

Perhaps the most widely ignored, sensitive area of concern in school desegregation is the question of social activities involving black and white students. Only one community project visited attempted to work on this question: The **Bogalusa** program. The more difficult-to-implement second phase of this program is a bi-racial, student-run snack bar. The narrative of the proposal explains the need: "All clubs and social-recreational activities were cancelled following court-ordered, full desegregation. An integrated football team and band do exist; however, no social activities do, with the exception of a sophomore service club started in 1970." The snack bar provides an opportunity for blacks and whites not only to work together in its daily operation, but to meet informally under supervised conditions. Since the LEA has proven unwilling to move in this direction, the non-LEA chose to.

Whether or not Bogalusans (students and their parents) will support, on a sustained bi-racial basis, the snack bar and its concomitant problems and opportunities is yet to be seen. But one thing seems clear from this description of a non-LEA program: there are a number of citizens in Bogalusa, both black and white, who feel the goal is a worthwhile one. The old excuse used by so many LEAs that the community is not ready for "racial mixing of the sexes after school"—to quote a school official—is being challenged.

4. Promoting Understanding Among Parents

One of the chief problems of school desegregation is attitudes, particularly those held by the "older" generation—parents and teachers. One often hears, "The kids get along fine if the adults will just leave them alone." Yet very few ESAP grants (either LEA or non-LEA) directed themselves to this important, if difficult area.

One exception to this is the **Tri-Parish Consortium** which worked directly with parents in three school districts* (called parish school systems) in Louisiana. Professor Raymond Floyd of Southern University designed the program, which operated with the largest grant in Louisiana and one of the largest in the entire ESAP community grant appropriation. The purpose of this pro-

---

* The three parishes involved were: East Baton Rouge, a generally middle-class parish, made up of many people who work in government offices or the many businesses located in the capital city of Baton Rouge; St. Helena, a markedly poor parish and neighbor of the third participating area, rural Tangipahoa, home of the predominantly white largest teacher training liberal arts college in the state, Southeastern Louisiana University.

gram was to promote parent involvement in the schools by providing a loosely structured environment in which black and white parents could meet (in many cases, for the first time) on an equal basis to discuss problems related to desegregation in their schools. Five meetings were held in each of several different sections of the three parishes (section meetings were necessary due to travel distances in these large parishes). Meetings were usually held at a centrally located school and followed a format of large group presentation followed by small group discussion of presentation content. Each session lasted about three hours, and the topics for consideration were:

"Why We Need to Know Each Other" (presentation by local school principals)
"Growing Up Different" (presentation by Department of Sociology Chairman at Southern University)
"We Can Make It If You Will Help Us" (presenters were local students)
"We (Parents) Listen, But Do We Always Hear?" (presenters: Director of Guidance Department of East Baton Rouge Public Schools and Education Department Head at Southeastern Louisiana University)
Evaluation (parents discussed value of previous four meetings)

In order to cover expenses participating parents would incur through travel (for some the roundtrip distance was 80 miles) and babysitting costs, participants were paid $10 for each meeting. Another reason for the costs stipend, frankly and probably realistically acknowledged by Director Floyd, was to attract the "hard core" who would be reluctant to attend since it would mean an explanation to inquiring neighbors as to why they had attended these "integration meetings"; they could always say they had gone for the money. Some parents felt the remuneration was unnecessary, though perhaps this is due to the tendency of participants to be from the middle class. By the project's own evaluation, it was recommended that in future programs careful attention should be given to the selection of participants so as to assure a cross section of the parental population. Those involved in the program should represent all socio-economic strata of the community.[26] Perhaps the rationale for the stipend applies more usefully to the non-middle class participants, but, of course, no discreet distinction could be made between those who need to be paid and those who do not. This remains, then, a necessary expense.

ACT Education Program, in an alliance with the Mobile League of Women Voters, sponsored a series of parent workshops in which small group discussions followed the viewing of a provocative film ("Black White: Uptight"). The parent meetings were held during the end of the summer and provided a rare opportunity

for discussions on the 1971-72 desegregation plan which involves the use of busing. The LEA fully supported ACT in these parent workshops. The superintendent and various members of his staff participated. The LEA was in a position to gain considerably by this non-LEA program. The slogan for the workshops was "Make It Work."

5. Parent Leadership Training

The **Birmingham Urban League's ESAP** design trains parents "to become leaders in their community, so that they can affect the kind of schools that community has." Project Director Harold Gaines, an effective teacher with an impressive knowledge of his community, leads the weekly meetings of this bi-racial group. Participants—all welfare mothers—are paid $3 per meeting. Each lasts 2-3 hours and continues over a 15 week period. Through these meetings the mothers are taught how to identify educational problems, where to go to find information on a problem, how to separate useful fact and idle gossip, and how to use the information to solve the problem. The course content is practical. The teaching techniques involve active roles for the parents. The goal, to quote Director Gaines, is "to provide personal knowledge that can carry on after ESAP."

Programs mentioned earlier such as **Texans for Educational Improvement of Mexican Americans (TEAM)** and **MAEC** in Houston also are accomplishing this in a less formal way.

IV. EVALUATION

Many questions can be raised in evaluating a program of this kind, but not all of them can be answered scientifically or definitively. By whose standards are these community grants to be measured? That is, if a tutorial program is making do with amateur tutors, is it valid to criticize that program because it is not teaching a child to read when the school system also failed to teach him? How shall credit be determined for improving race relations in a town, when there may be a number of programs and events, some subtle, some explicit, which affect the situation? Who can ever know what change took place in the private thoughts of a white woman in Sparta, Georgia, whose maid is the treasurer of the community ESAP advisory board, and who sees another advisory board member bring the pay checks to the treasurer each month to be signed? By what means can the value of a highly professional newsletter be compared with a homemade, mimeographed one produced by local, community people with a very different point of view and set of concerns? Which is the more valid newsletter, the one that reaches professional people and provides them with statistics on how desegregation is working, or the one that informs parents of a neighborhood school meeting at which the new reading program is being explained? Many LEA-ESAP grants provide for newsletters, most of which hope to demonstrate the positive gains of desegregated schools and thereby regain white confidence. Is that a task for the local education agency or a community group? Do newsletters of any type affect the reader's thinking and if so, how is that evidenced? How can one measure what it means to have a community sit down and talk across racial barriers? Have they really talked honestly? Has any learning taken place?

The central question of an evaluation of the ESAP community grants is, of course, whether the funds reserved for them have helped "to eliminate racial segregation and discrimination" in school programs, and whether these projects are doing that as

well as or better than, or differently from, school systems who are receiving grants through the 90 percent portion of ESAP funds. It is too soon to answer that question definitely.

In spite of the difficulty of such questions and in spite of the short life of these community-sponsored programs, however, some preliminary judgments can be made on the basis of the visits made for this report. The judgments listed briefly below are fully explained in the text that follows:

1. **The use of volunteers and supplementary unpaid or low-paid resources is impressive and has strengthened these programs.**
2. **The role of students on a meaningful participatory level remains limited even in those programs aimed at students.**
3. **Staffing of the programs is uneven in terms of quality and several programs have been hindered by the use of an absentee grantsman who wrote the proposal.**
4. **The use of professionals with little or no community-based development (particularly in Type A Programs) is of questionable value.**
5. **The need for technical assistance has been met inadequately by the Office of Education particularly in the area of assisting grantees to think through the real cost of program goals.**
6. **Some of the programs provide an excellent example of the most effective way to use short-term Federal support.**
7. **The relationship to school administrations is often troublesome for the non-LEA grantee, though some have overcome remarkable opposition. Nevertheless, evidence of lack of cooperation suggests that school systems ought to be required to cooperate with community ESAP groups in order to receive their own ESAP funds.**
8. **There have been serious, crippling differences in OE policy and practice toward LEA and non-LEA grantees.**
9. **Some grants are visibly affecting and positively changing the programs of the local education agencies.**

1. Use of Volunteers

One of the most impressive findings of the site visits to these projects is their use of volunteers and untapped resources within the community. It suggests one answer to the question of what community groups do that LEAs tend not to do. Since most programs operate on a small budget (when compared to that available to the LEA) to achieve their goals, it is imperative that resourcefulness be applied to rally volunteer services. An outstanding example of such resourcefulness is the **ACT Education Program**

in Mobile, Alabama, under the vigorous leadership of Henry Rembert, a native of Mobile.

In order to offer a summer series of lectures on black history, the director arranged for services without cost from a local teacher. The teacher gave lectures and led discussions on such topics as slavery, comparisons between the American Revolution of the 18th century and the Black Revolution of the 20th century, and the various interpretations of the Black Movement including those of separatists and integrationists. Films shown at these meetings were loaned rent-free by nearby Spring Hill College. In order to insure that the widest possible audience could participate, each of the five lessons was offered at two different hours (4:00-5:00 P.M. and 8:00-9:30 P.M.). These sessions were well attended by some 500 (total) community members. Most were black students, though a significant number of white students and black parents also participated.

ACT operated three tutorial programs (for pre-school to 9th grade children), one in a poor white and two in poor black neighborhoods. This was made possible through the use of black and white volunteer tutors. People of the community donated their homes as tutorial sites. Many of the consumable materials used in the program were donated by local businesses to which Mr. Rembert had written asking for help.

By making use of the public information rights to television, the ACT director arranged for a weekly thirty-minute television program which runs each Sunday morning at 8 o'clock and is called "Lift Ev'ry Voice." Two local media experts coordinate the program without cost. The program's content is aimed chiefly at the black community, though religious leaders, local talent and leadership from both races are included in most programs.

In attempts to stretch their budgets, which allow for only very small staffs, some projects made use of Neighborhood Youth Corpsmen (NYC). The **Alabama Learning and Literacy Program** in Birmingham used 30 NYC students as tutors, thus facilitating a much larger program than their budget, which could pay only 12 tutors, would otherwise have allowed. The **Birmingham Urban League** uses work-study students from the University of Alabama and Miles College, toward whose pay they contribute only 35¢ per hour.

Mexican American Education Council ESAP Director, Eliseo Cisneros, and his Center Coordinator, Bennie Reyes, demonstrate an enormous knowledge of resources available in the Houston area and a capacity for gathering those resources, often on a volunteer basis or for very little money. The best example of this is the 153 teachers they gathered who volunteered to tutor and counsel Chicano students, particularly those in danger of dropping out of high school. The tutoring was carried out after school hours.

PROJECTS EVALUAT

TYPE	GRANTEE	LOCATION
B	ACT Education Program	Mobile, Ala.
B	Alabama Literacy and Learning Program	Birmingham, Ala.
A	Atlanta University	Atlanta, Ga.
B	These grants were made to A.U., but are spent in the location sited, with a percentage of budget going to A.U. for overhead	Candler County Metter, Ga. Hancock-Glascock Sparta, Ga.
A	Birmingham Urban League (USSAC)	Birmingham, Ala.
B	Bogalusa Voters League	Bogalusa, La.
A	Educational Resources Center (ERC)	Jackson, Miss.
B	McComb Community Center	McComb, Miss.
B	Mexican American Education Council (MAEC)	Houston, Texas
A	Mississippi Association of Student Councils, Inc	Prentiss, Miss.
A	Public Affairs Research Council (PAR)	Baton Rouge, La.
B	Desire Community Center	New Orleans, La.
B	Southern Mutual Help Assn.	Abbeyville, La. Thibodaux, La.
A	Southern University	Baton Rouge, La.
A	Texans for Educational Advancement of Mexican Americans (TEAM)	San Antonio, Tex.
B	Tri-County Community Center	Rankin County, Miss.

NOTE: Appendix A contains information such as address an

ED IN THIS REPORT

FUNDS	NATURE OF PROGRAM
$ 60,000	community information/tutorial
68,312	cultural enrichment/literacy training
57,000	technical assistance to non-LEA ESAP grantees
17,300	tutorial
63,000	tutorial/study centers
38,000	parent/student leadership training; rumor control
11,268	tutorial; student snack bar
105,390	community information; parent leadership training
17,411	tutorial
167,209	tutorial/education counseling/community education
24,000	student activities
71,930	community information newsletter
29,317	tutorial
27,200	tutorial/community information
22,000	student understanding
223,000	tri-parish parent meetings
293,694	twelve county community information/parent leadership training
52,997	tutorial/community information and relations

d telephone number of the project plus the director's name.

Aside from using Neighborhood Youth Corpsmen (who did a large survey of high school drop-outs as well as recent graduates), the MAEC of Houston made contacts with the Trinity University internship program in order to gain the services of a sociology master's candidate.

Another program which expanded the potential effect of its design through the acquisition of non-paid, quality employees was the **Southern Mutual Help Association,** located in the heart of Cajun Louisiana (southwestern section of the state). Through contacts with Antioch College and various internship programs, they employed several additional people.

Four of the ten tutorial programs visited operate with volunteers. One of them, the **Bogalusa Voters League,** operates out of a suitable rent-free building in a neutral (considered neither the black nor the white) section of town. The local paper mill gave them an air conditioner. Other materials such as chairs, two water coolers, a file cabinet, and a fan were donated by local citizens who "want to see the program work." Many of the books used by the program were taken, with permission, from one of the black schools closed by school desegregation. Unfortunately, none of those materials are multi-ethnic textbooks.

To put into operation the second phase of the Bogalusa ESAP grant, a student snack bar, members of the advisory board found a low rent site near the center of town. The redecorating and adjustments to the kitchen are being done by a local craftsman and his crew of volunteers, all merely for the cost of the materials. The daily operation of the snack bar will be run by a bi-racial team of four students and one adult supervisor. Students will be paid a minimum wage, but the adult supervisor will be a volunteer.

2. *Role of Students*

The role of students on a meaningful, consistent level of participation appears limited even in those programs aimed at students. The problem of adult domination exists. The **Bogalusa** snack bar is a program which desperately needs more student input. Although student advisory board members were most enthusiastic about the snack bar, they have not taken a clear leadership position in its establishment.

In the case of the **Mississippi Student Council** program, students have not played a determining role either in the program design for the regional conferences or as keynote speakers or group discussion leaders at these gatherings. While students were present as program welcomers and hosts on the campuses where conferences were held, it was the adults who were in charge. Students should have been polled for suggestions on discussed topics at the meetings. Many important questions were raised, such as the use of democratic (meaning majority rule)

elections in schools of predominantly one race. But they were raised by adults both in lecture and adult-led discussion groups, rather than in student debate.

Small group discussions should have allowed for more active participation by students, many of whom were shy and unwilling to speak. In a well-meaning effort to stimulate conversation, several groups were dominated by adult leaders who gave their views on solutions. A skilled group leader can facilitate student discussion by waiting out the initial silences and inviting students to try other means of expression, such as role-playing.

The problem of adult domination is difficult for both student and adults, who are accustomed to playing the respective roles of follower and leader. But in an activity such as student councils, whose aim is to provide experience for future leaders, it is a serious criticism.

3. Staffing Problems

Money is not always the answer to a program's ills. The key ingredient in any program is the director and the quality of staff he is able to attract. Because the future of positions created by ESAP is likely to be short-range, many programs have suffered from loss of staff to more secure jobs. **The Alabama Learning and Literacy Program** lost three of its five staff members within the first trimester of its program. **The Thibodaux Youth Program** had a similar experience. **The Educational Resources Center** in Jackson, Mississippi, has been handicapped by change of directors—three in a short period of time—each of whom must have felt frustration in running a program for which he had not himself developed priorities and hired staff.

In fact, this frustration existed even in programs that have had stable directorships. Many community ESAP grants operate from a proposal written by someone other than the person charged with the responsibility of carrying out the program. This is particularly evident in the case of the **Birmingham Urban League's** ESA Program. Because the National Urban League wrote a "master plan" which was then applied to local problems, the Birmingham director is faced with the problem of carrying out someone else's concept of what his community needs. For example, the national proposal calls for the establishment of a rumor control clinic. Such a clinic was operated last year by a concerned group of citizens and could have continued into this school year, thus releasing the director's talent to other areas of need. Instead, his small staff is faced with this time-consuming responsibility. Because he is such a capable community organizer, he ought to have had the freedom to define his own program.

Small programs sometimes suffer from the unavailability of personnel experienced in the wheeling and dealing necessary to

carry out a community program in the face of local opposition. An example of such a program is the **Metter, Georgia,** tutorial program, run by a local woman full of enthusiasm and ideas for this job but unfamiliar with techniques of dealing with the power and control of the white county superintendent. Despite his opposition and the fear which he engendered in his employees, she did operate a summer program which used two LEA employees. On the budget of $17,300, the opportunity is small for hiring additional staff, such as a community organizer to assist the director in dealing with political realities of this small, rural South Georgia county.

4. Use of Professionals

Not all of the non-LEA programs visited are run by grassroots community people. To repeat the definition of community involvement used by ESAP officials: community involvement "refers to the meaningful participation of individuals served by a community project in the actual day to day implementation and direction of that project."

Southern University's grant (Type A), which was one of the three largest amounts granted to any of the more than 150 non-LEA grantees, is run entirely by professionals, though it is directed entirely toward parents, most of whom are non-professional. No parents from the target communities sit on its advisory board; no community people determine what the program content will be.

Unlike previously mentioned programs which stretch small budgets through volunteer or low-paid staff, this project has had a significant portion of its huge budget devoted to consultant (28 percent) and staff (20 percent) costs. People who visited principals in each parish to enlist cooperation and gain support and sometimes to select parents were known as "community stimulators." They were listed in the budget with salaries of $300 per month. Other personnel hired for the project were group discussion leaders, a battery of whom were East Baton Rouge guidance counselors trained specially for this. Some discussion leaders were university professors, and in one case, the superintendent of one of the three parishes. All were paid anywhere from $50 to $75 per session plus travel expenses. The topic presentors received $100 per presentation. Significantly, the student panel, members of which were not paid, was voted by parent participants the most valuable program of the series.*

For the farthest reaching effects, the program should have trained a cadre of twenty or more parents to work as community facilitators or bi-racial group discussion leaders who could operate long after ESAP funding has come and gone. Instead, the roles

---

* Office of Education practice discourages paying students either as participants or as speakers.

of community facilitator and group discussion leaders were taken by university professors and guidance counselors.

The **Public Affairs Research Council** (Louisiana) uses no community-based people in its ESA Program, on either the advisory board or newsletter staff. This may be justifiable since its target population is largely professional. Sensitive to this problem, PAR seeks to overcome it by buying articles from a variety of sources, some non-professional, throughout the state.

There is a growing resentment among community people of *the highly paid professional* who, by virtue of his education degrees, is called in to help a community help itself. In the case of the **Tri-Parish Consortium** (Louisiana), two parent groups have elected to continue independently their bi-racial meetings since the close of the ESAP-funded meetings. On one hand, no more hearty endorsement of the Tri-Parish Consortium could be made, but this decision to go it alone also reflects the notion that local people feel they are the experts on local problems and while they may need some assistance in learning how to lead a good group discussion (and have asked for and received assistance in this from Tri-Parish Consortium Director Dr. Floyd), they are capable of accomplishing their goals without the well-paid professional.

This does not suggest that there is no role for the professional in community ESAP programs. There is. This merely suggests that that role ought to be a self-limiting one in which the professional is paid to render those services in which he is professionally trained in such a way that the group is better able to operate independently as a result of his services. For example, many college professors have developed Federal grant-writing skills. Providing this type of assistance to a community group is an appropriate role for the professional, but such assistance would have the greatest value if it were rendered in conjunction with the people who will carry out the proposed program.

5. Technical Assistance Needs

Budget Problems

As the program visits progressed, a pattern became increasingly evident to the writer. The more a program is operated on a meaningful day-to-day basis by local, non-professional, grassroots folks, the leaner the budget. The more the program is run by professionals, the larger the budget, particularly in the administrative cost line item. The writer found more than one non-professional program in which staff were paying for travel expenses or operational items such as Xeroxing out of their own pockets. Others cut out desirable activities which they realized they could not afford, such as field trips for the students, or they ended up charging a small, but for some children exclusionary, fee.

One cannot help but wonder, first, why those grassroots people who "may be in a better position to carry out some types of activities essential to the integration of schools"[27] are assigned the smallest portion (10 percent) of the pie. Are they not also the people who are most often affected by the failures of the schools to educate their children?

Next one wonders why such low or excessively high budgets got past the Office of Education program officers and review panels who were in a position to cut budgets or to advise applicants on the realistic need for more funds. For example, some groups thought they could run an effective tutorial with volunteers, but found out that those who had volunteered back in October and November when the program was surrounded with enthusiasm, were not available in April and May when the program was finally funded. They ought to have been advised against relying totally on volunteers.

One of the most poorly budgeted areas in the case of the tutorials was the purchase of suitable materials. Too many have had to rely on castaways from the public schools. These programs ought to have been able to provide the newest, most suitable learning materials.

Occasionally, the writer found that programs had budget appropriations that were questionable in the face of all their needs. One tutorial program purchased a top quality stereo sound system because they believed it would aid them in attracting high school students into the program. They did not have sufficient learning materials for the students, however. Rather than be faced with the impossible choice of which is of greater importance, they should have been advised that a larger budget allowance for consumable and non-consumable materials was appropriate. In the face of the large responsibilities which the small Educational Resources Center staff faces in the state of Mississippi, the rental of a Xerox machine appears excessive. Yet, it is constantly in use. In fact, were the machine cut out of the budget, the burden on the present staff would be increased. Therefore, the problem is not that they rent a Xerox machine but that they ought to have been advised to increase their budget to be able to hire more staff.

OE Technical Assistance

For at least half of the programs visited, the need for some form of technical assistance was readily acknowledged by the staff. A clearing house of current, relevant materials and sources of films, texts, contact persons and teaching materials is needed. Operational problems, such as simple, effective record-keeping, also suggest the need for technical assistance.

The Office of Education Community Groups ESAP Office has provided some necessary help through their program officers and through regional conferences. While these conferences addressed

themselves to a variety of operational details, many of the grantees had already faced the problem and arrived at some solution by the time the conference was held; the conference was held in mid-August and most programs had been funded in March or April. For example, matters such as "Selection and Recruitment of the Advisory Group" and "Recruiting, Selection and Development of Project Staff" are two subjects which all but a very few participants had handled.

Also, participation in these conferences meant an unplanned-for expense since all grantees' living costs during the two and one-half days had to be assumed by their own budget. Technical assistance to local education agencies has never cost the school system money. Free assistance is available from both the state and regional Title IV offices, and from Title IV University Centers,[28] at any time. The writer knows of at least one community group which sent three staff members, who drove a considerable distance with gas paid for by two advisory board members and who assumed the costs of food and lodging from their own pockets in order to avoid using any money which was needed so desperately by the students in their program.

Probably the greatest value of these OE workshops was that they allowed fellow grantees to meet each other and exchange information. There is a great need for this, particularly among the smaller, less professional grantees who expressed feelings of isolation and asked the writer questions like, "Are there other programs such as ours? How do they handle . . . ?"

The OE workshop which the writer visited on August 19 and 20 was well attended. In addition, two ESAP grantees **(ERC in Mississippi** and **ACT of Mobile, Alabama)** organized their own conference of non-LEA directors before the Washington conference was announced. These conferences were not as well attended, perhaps because of what one grantee told an ERC staff member: "We didn't know who ERC was . . . friend or foe?"

For future OE conferences, a more individualized form of instruction should be used. The OE conference used small group discussions *after* a major topic presentation (such as "Selection and Recruitment of the Advisory Group"). Not all community ESAP grants have everything in common. For example, tutorial programs are confronting a different set of problems from grantees who publish monthly newsletters. Programs with budgets in excess of $100,000 are in a totally different league from those with $10-20,000 budgets. Grantees from Mississippi may have very different problems from their colleagues in Georgia. At conferences there should be grouping according to scope and objectives of the programs and very little large group instruction.

The **Atlanta University Technical Assistance Team** came closer to providing the quality of help needed than did the Office of Education in its regional workshops. Atlanta University-TAT mails

to all Georgia non-LEA grantees a newsletter which according to reports from grantees provides a valuable communication link among them, and keeps grantees informed of the kinds of services TAT offers. When one observes the degree of communication and trust obvious at recent Atlanta University-TAT workshops and feels the sense of "getting a job done" conveyed by the community participants, one can conclude that this is money well spent.

6. *Proper Use of Federal Support*

As mentioned earlier, it is only realistic to design a program which recognizes the brevity of any Federally supported program. It was the wise group that developed programs which would affect its community even after the life of ESAP. The term "seed money" is appropriate particularly for those programs of parent leadership training. **ACT of Mobile, Alabama,** the **Birmingham Urban League,** the **Educational Resources Center** of Mississippi, and the state-wide **Texans for Educational Improvement of Mexican Americans (TEAM)** are all programs with specific parent leadership training components.

Indeed, it is clear that virtually all the ESAP grantees visited which have community-based advisory boards have increased parent awareness, and provided an opportunity for them to become involved in the decision-making process on critical issues which affect their lives and the educational lives of their children. It is also clear that the existence of a Parent Teachers Organization in a school does not provide this same opportunity. The striking thing about the advisory boards of most programs visited is the involvement and influence of people who are usually intimidated by a formal, professionally-based organization such as the PTA. This has been obvious in those all-black schools which had an active PTA until they were desegregated. If the PTA remained in existence, it usually became a white-dominated organization. Also, because ESAP is designed to give a role to non-professionals, those community people who have had ideas about the problems their schools face have been given a legitimate role and are doing the job, regardless of their lack of formal education, or previous leadership experience.

7. *Relationships to Local Education Agencies*

"Projects will be much more effective in furthering the desegregation process if there is close cooperation and a two-way flow of information between the LEA and the community group."[29] No one can disagree with this statement from the Federal ESAP Handbook. A quarrel could develop, however, over the use of the words "two-way flow," which imply two equal parties working cooperatively toward the same goal. Such is rarely the case. Indeed, implications and rumors which floated around the recent

Office of Education regional workshops suggested strongly that in the next "go-round" only those community groups with direct and firm alliances with the LEA will be funded. The question is why is the burden of responsibility being placed on the non-LEA for the establishment of this alliance? This is not where the problem of cooperation lies!

To deal with professional educators is to move into the realm of jealously-guarded territories—an atmosphere not conducive to forming alliances, and "two-way flows" of information. In several cases, what this guideline effectively requires is that the very community people who pressed for the desegregation of the LEA in the first place, and are now in a position to apply for the non-LEA money, must seek the cooperation of those with whom their last contact was through lawyers in a court of law. For example, the **Bogalusa Voters League,** under the name of one of its officers, sued the Bogalusa public schools to end freedom-of-choice and fully desegregate all schools. The sister of the litigant in that case was hired as program director and therefore is in charge of handling public and LEA relations. This community group was to learn early that the old lines of resistance had not faded within the LEA.

On November 27, before submitting their proposal, the advisory board for the Bogalusa Voters League proposal wrote to the superintendent:

> "With this letter, it is our intention to not only inform you of the proposal, but also to assure you of our earnest intention to work harmoniously with you in achieving the goals we know you share: quality education and good human relations within the desegregated public schools of Bogalusa . . . Should our proposal be funded, we look forward to your support and counsel."

The letter was never acknowledged.

The director (a young, highly-qualified teacher refused employment by the Bogalusa schools despite the known shortage of black teachers) then began her efforts to meet with the superintendent to discuss possible cooperation. The director was "put off" repeatedly and finally worked through one of the black assistant principals and a long-employed white teacher to obtain the loan of materials lying unused on the floors of one of the abandoned black elementary schools.

Perhaps coincidentally, the part-time secretary who was hired by the tutorial program was fired from her job with the school board the day after the announcement was made in the Bogalusa *Daily News.* Fortunately for the program and the Bogalusa public schools, that superintendent has retired and his successor already

38

has attended an advisory board meeting. In the writer's interview with him, he suggested that he and his principals would cooperate with the tutorial program in identifying those students in need of help. The point of this case still remains, despite its happy ending. What chances are there for cooperation without equal effort?

Such cases suggest that a more equitable (realistic?) way of insuring the desired mutual cooperation is to make funding for both the LEA and the non-LEA contingent upon the establishment of reciprocal cooperation. For example, the non-LEA ought to be permitted to comment on the LEA proposal and the LEA ought to be required to state what is its relationship to the community ESAP group and how it provides for cooperation.

Despite the difficulties and sometimes hostile receptions the non-LEAs have had from the LEAs, there are notable examples of cooperation gained by the community. One such example is the **Rankin County** ESAP project. The superintendent of schools was adamantly opposed to the project's director, Mr. Jimmy Harvey, and its parent organization, the Tri-County Community Center. He expressed his opposition to the proposal in a letter to the Office of Education prior to approval of funding. However, in a recent election, this superintendent was replaced by a man who was so impressed with the community group that he asked Mr. Harvey if he might use the non-LEA advisory board as the advisory board for the LEA-ESAP proposal! He has also agreed to allow the tutorial's use of school buildings and some unused materials.

The **Community Coalition for Public Schools** (CCPS) in Jackson, Mississippi (a program investigated by telephone and therefore not listed in the table of those programs visited) seems to have established an outstanding relationship with the LEA, one which is full of opportunity for both. In planning the human relations program for which the LEA-ESAP is funded, the superintendent of schools requested participation and input from the non-LEA program (CCPS). He and the CCPS director have appeared together on local radio shows and before the Jackson Human Relations Council panel to describe their respective programs and the cooperation between them. Superintendent Sparkman stated publicly that he relies on the Community Coalition for support and counsel. He requested that this non-LEA group train the bus drivers and bus monitors in a school-sponsored preparatory program before Jackson schools opened this fall under a "busing" plan. He has involved the CCPS in plans for a Community Education Law Program planned for later in the year.

The **Alabama Learning and Literacy Program** of Birmingham received sanction from school administrators to go into elementary schools to investigate literacy problems and—where invited by the principal—to provide literacy training for teachers and parents of students with reading difficulties.

8. *Office of Education Favoritism of LEA Programs*

From the outset, serious differences have existed between the Office of Education's attitude toward the school districts' (LEA) ESAP grants and the community (non-LEA) ESAP grants. For example, grant review procedures and funding were expedited for LEA grant proposals to such an extent that most professional grantees began operation before the community grantees had received the application forms! Reference has been made to the need for a requirement of reciprocal cooperation between the school district ESAP and the community ESAP grantees; this could be accomplished more effectively if the two groups apply and are funded at approximately the same time. To allow one group a head start of six to eight months over the other is to reduce the possibilities for cooperative efforts.

Furthermore, any technical assistance rendered to the professional grantee was without cost to its budget, while the community grantees had to cover the costs of attending OE conferences. Because the LEA grants were administered out of the regional Title IV office, more funds and personnel for technical assistance were available to school districts than to the community grantees. University Title IV Centers were advised by Commissioner of Education Marland to render absolutely no assistance to community ESAP applicants although these centers were expected to render full assistance to school district applicants.

This policy confused and frustrated some community groups for whom technical assistance in dealing with Federal procedures and other problems has been scarce. This is due to the significantly larger staffs for assistance available to school systems as opposed to community groups. For example, the school system could ask for ESAP assistance from either the state Title IV Center, the state Title IV office in the education agency, or the regional Title IV office, which has at least two or three program officers working in each state. The community grantee, on the other hand, had only one program officer to turn to in Washington, and he had to share that one not only with all other community applicants in his state, but with those in one or two other states.

All school district representatives were invited to introductory regional meetings held in September, immediately following passage of the ESAP bill. Because of the limited total amount of money available to community (non-LEA) groups, not all capable, interested and eligible groups could be invited to the informational conference sponsored by the Office of Education in October. Nor could the budget accommodate regional conferences within each state as had been the case with the portion (90 percent) of the ESAP money reserved for school districts.

And finally, without fault to the Washington administrators of the Community Groups Office, not all eligible and useful applicants could be funded. This is particularly exasperating in light of the

documented evidence that many school districts which were ineligible because of continued discriminatory practices[30] received ESAP funds.

9. *Affecting School Programs*

There are several indications in this early evaluation that local education agencies have been affected positively by the existence of a non-LEA program in their community.

Parents in two of the parishes participating in the **Tri-Parish Consortium** have continued to meet. They have inspected schools prior to the opening (found two unclean and forced officials to correct this), met with their superintendent and principals and studied (somewhat in the style of the League of Women Voters) problems such as the curriculum. More importantly, this group has been concerned about school personnel who send their children to private schools while being employed by the public schools. This is a hot issue in Tangipahoa Parish and school board members, principals and teachers who support private segregation academies should not underestimate the power of this group of black and white parents who share a desire for quality schools supported by the public of both races.

By embarrassing the LEA through their proposal for a tutorial system, the **Bogalusa Voters League** caused school officials (to be sure, under pressure from Title IV) to work on remedial problems long ignored.

ACT Education Program, in its workshops co-sponsored by the League of Women Voters, attracted a wide audience of Mobile citizens and provided a forum for the LEA to educate the public which obviously lessened the opposition to the busing necessary to achieve full desegregation this fall.

The **Mexican American Education Council** in Houston has already proven that through proper guidance counseling and tutoring the number of Chicano high school graduates and Chicano students enrolled in college significantly increases.

By use of new education models other programs are expected to affect the LEA. **Hancock-Glascock Counties'** project employed eight of the local high school teachers (a sizeable percentage of this small school system) and the Hancock High School principal in its summer program which established an Upward Bound program for 165 students. Since teaching methods, student-teacher relationships and teaching materials were innovative and highly successful, as judged through both student attitudes (no vandalism was experienced, for example) and comparison of test scores, the lesson of this ESAP project is bound to affect the LEA. This program did something to Hancock County (the predominantly black county in this two-county program). One of the town's lifelong black citizens described it eloquently: "We're in the beginning of a renaissance."

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Despite all dire predictions to the contrary, the community grant programs funded by ESAP are in business. They have been able to overcome opposition from school officials, problems of small staffs and budgets, late funding and confusing administration from the Office of Education. More importantly, they have moved into areas of need which few other groups—school systems or other established agencies—have tried to serve. These areas have been described throughout the report, but because of their importance to this preliminary evaluation they are summarized here:

There are non-LEA grantees that have provided opportunities and services for students and affected them in ways not often known in the formal school structure. In the tutorial programs, notably in Abbeyville, Louisiana, students have established a warm personal relationship with their tutors. Other tutorial programs have provided instruction in ethnic heritage, and facilitated student discussions on matters crucial to those students who are in the minority at desegregated high schools. Matters such as student election procedures, racially-balanced homecoming courts and black-white student and teacher relationships are of deep importance to students. Students involved in the Alabama Learning and Literacy Program (Birmingham) had the opportunity to act out these concerns in original drama productions. Students in the McComb tutorial program had reserved a specific time in their weekly academic schedule for student-run rap sessions. Thibodaux, Louisiana's program devoted a day and a half for a student concerns retreat. The fact that community ESAP grants legitimized these opportunities for students' affective development is to their credit and should be imitated and expanded by the school systems. And in addition, community projects, of which the Houston MAEC program is the best example, made themselves responsible for high school students on whom the

public schools had given up: those students who had dropped out or had considered doing so or high school graduates for whom college admission had been an unknown quantity.

Community grant ESAP projects have brought together parents in bi-racial discussion groups (Tri-Parish Consortium in Louisiana and ACT in Mobile, Alabama) some of which have carried on after the close of the ESAP-sponsored meetings. They have provided, through the bi-racial advisory boards, working relationships among community people. Some have given, to a much greater extent than is evident in school system ESAP advisory boards, the decision-making powers to community members. The most notable example of that is the Hancock County (Georgia) Advisory Board.

These programs have raised parents' consciousness level by introducing new educational models such as the open classroom. Projects like TEAM (Texas) and the Birmingham Urban League have informed parents about how the school system works, reducing the feeling of helplessness and alienation from the formal school structure. Others have taught parents techniques of affecting directly their children's education (such as teaching parents how to teach reading).

Some community projects have made school systems more accountable to the community. Houston Independent School District has hired more Chicano teachers in response to MAEC action on the problem. Bogalusa public schools have offered a remedial program to students as a direct consequence of the community program.

ESAP has made it possible for many community groups to organize themselves. Where there was a loose federation of interested people (as in Bogalusa) there developed a foundation on which to unite in focus and purpose. Where there was a united but financially struggling organization (as with MAEC in Houston), ESAP funds enabled them to increase significantly their service to the community.

Although this report is a preliminary one, it is possible to say that the community projects portion of the Emergency School Assistance Program has already demonstrated its promise.

* * *

In the future, however, it could be made more effective. The following recommendations on administrative procedure and criteria are based upon experience in compiling data and writing this report:

1. The Office of Education should reorganize the technical assistance provided to community groups. It should examine the effectiveness of professional assistance now provided at the state level on such matters as accounting,

access to materials and useful resources, use of media, etc. A university grant is not always the best way to provide such assistance, nor are regional conferences, but there should be readily available assistance at no extra cost.

2. The Office of Education should establish more stringent criteria for grants to professional groups under the community program. Only a small portion of the total ought to go to such grants, and only where community-based advisory boards are actively involved in the management of the program. The budgets of such grants should not provide significantly greater reimbursement for "professionals" than for other participants, and the use of extensive consultant fees should be carefully monitored.

3. The Office of Education should provide better advice on budget needs to applicants, so that adequate funds for staff, materials, transportation and technical assistance are available to meet approved program goals. Uniform standards ought to be considered for payments to parents participating in workshops and to students who attend workshops or act as discussion leaders.

4. The Office of Education should continually evaluate the participation of advisory boards in community programs, and require such participation in new and continuing programs.

5. The Office of Education should give funding priority to community-sponsored ethnic awareness programs, as well as to the parent education and community information programs that are proving most effective. More effort should be made to encourage student service programs, and to emphasize student decision-making in such projects.

6. The Office of Education should give more attention to the importance of compensatory programs so frequently designated as a critical need by community groups. If tutorials and drop-out programs are indeed an essential ingredient in the desegregation process, as many parents and students indicate, the community grant ESAP program need not bear the whole burden for organizing them. School systems should be encouraged to use their 90 percent funds, and other available Federal education funds, on such locally-identified needs. And they should take the advice and example of successful community-run compensatory programs into account in their planning and operation.

7. The Office of Education should establish equity between the community and school system parts of the Emergency School Assistance Program, so that the burden of cooperation and agreement rests equally on both elements. LEAs

should not have the power unilaterally to veto a community grant application from their districts. Funding should be coordinated and authorized at the same time for both, and equivalent help should be provided to all applicants.

FOOTNOTES

1. "Terminal desegregation plans" are comprehensive plans required by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to desegregate completely all grades in all schools in districts which have not yet achieved that standard.

2. *Title 45, Public Welfare,* Chapter I, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Part 181, Emergency School Assistance Program, p. 7, sec. 181, 3(b).

3. *The Emergency School Assistance Program: An Evaluation,* prepared by: American Friends Service Committee; Delta Ministry of National Council of Churches; Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; Lawyers Constitutional Defense Council; NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund; and Washington Research Project, November, 1970.

4. *Need to Improve Policies and Procedures for Approving Grants Under the Emergency School Assistance Program,* Report to the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, United States Senate, by Comptroller General of the United States, March, 1971.

5. *Handbook for Public and Private Non-Profit Organizations,* Emergency School Assistance Program.

6. *Information Handbook for Public and Private Non-Profit Organizations,* Emergency School Assistance Program, August, 1971 (revised), p. 3.

7. *Title 45, op. cit.,* Chapt. I, pp. 8-12. See also *Handbook,* pp. 3-5 and 11-15.

8. Educational Testing Service, *National Teachers Examination, Score Users,* July, 1971.

9. *Schools in Transition,* Vol. I, No. 2, August-September, 1971, p. 1.

10. *Handbook for Public and Private Non-Profit Organizations,* Emergency School Assistance Program, p. 10.

11. *Mexican-American Education Study, Report I: Ethnic Isolation of Mexican-Americans in the Public Schools of the Southwest,* U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, April, 1971, p. 19.

12. *Hearings Before the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity of the U. S. Senate,* 91st Congress, 2nd Session, August 18, 1970, p. 2391.

13. *Mexican-American Education Study, op. cit.,* p. 56 and p. 22.

14. *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders,* Executive Order 11365, Otto Kerner, Chairman, Bantam Books, 1968, p. 297.

15. *Hearings, op. cit.,* p. 2391.

16. *Mexican-American Education Study, op. cit.,* p. 25.

17. *Ibid.,* p. 28.

18. *Ibid.,* p. 12.

19. *Hearings, op. cit.,* pp. 2390-2391.

20. Texas Southern University, Special Services Project brochure, Houston, Texas, 1970.

21. *Title 45 Handbook, op. cit.,* p. 7.

22. *Daily-Comet* and *Times-Picayune,* August 11, 1971. (These are the newspapers which serve Thibodaux and nearby New Orleans, respectively.)

23. *Ibid.*

24. Letter of invitation addressed to school administrators and student council sponsors from Mitchel Gamblin, Director.

25. *High School Student Unrest: Education U.S.A. Special Report,* National School Public Relations Association, 1969, pp. 17-18.

26. "An Evaluation of Phase I—Tangipahoa Parish of the Tri-Parish Consortium for Enhancing School Desegregation," Dr. Walter Butler, April, 1971, p. 10.

27. *Handbook, op. cit.,* revised edition, p. i.

28. Title IV University Centers are established in every Southern state (as well as several Northern states) under the provision for technical assistance on desegregation problems authorized by Title IV of the Civil Rights Act. Their staffs are available to school district administrators on request.

29. *Handbook, op. cit.,* p. 6.

30. *ESAP: An Evaluation, op. cit.,* pp. 24-28.

APPENDIX A

ESAP Community Grant Programs Visited For This Report

ACT Education Program
2450 St. Stephen Road, Mobile, Alabama 36617
Henry Rembert, Director, 205-452-0321 or 452-5202

Mississippi State Association of Student Councils, Inc.
Box 432, Prentiss, Mississippi 39474
Mitchel Gamblin, Director, 601-792-4570

Alabama Literacy and Learning Program
300 Fourth Court North, Birmingham, Alabama 35204
Miss Margaret Minor, Director, 205-254-3462

Atlanta University Technical Assistance Team
School of Education, Center for School and Community Services
Atlanta, Georgia 30314
William H. Denton, Director, 404-681-0251

Candler County Improvement Association
Mrs. Edith Hobbs, Director
242 Salem Road, Metter, Georgia 30439, 912-685-2437

Hancock-Glascock Human Relations Council
Louis Becker, Director
1621 N. Decatur Road, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30307
404-378-0791

or

Mrs. Jamie Kennedy, Coordinator for Hancock County
P. O. Box 66, Sparta Georgia 31087, 404-444-5269

Mrs. Karen Philpott, Coordinator for Glascock County
Route 2, Gibson, Georgia 30810, 404-598-5943

Birmingham Urban League
505 N. 17th Street, Birmingham, Alabama 35203
Harold Gaines, Director, 205-252-5542

Bogalusa Voters League Tutorial Program
317 Third Street, Bogalusa, Louisiana 70427
Miss Willie Belle Exposé, Director, 504-735-9415

Educational Resources Center
603 Farish Street, Jackson, Mississippi 39203
Hermel Johnson, Director, 601-353-0412

McComb Community Center Tutorial Program
601 Old Summit Road, McComb, Mississippi
Mrs. Marjorie Galloway, Director, 601-283-2227

Mexican American Education Council
5504 Cochran Street, Houston, Texas 77009
Eliseo Cisneros, Director, 713-691-1393

Public Affairs Research Council
P. O. Box 3118, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821
Mrs. Pat Bowers, Director, 504-343-9204

Desire Community Homework Center
3309 Desire Parkway, New Orleans, Louisiana 70126
George Price, Director, 504-947-6629

Southern Mutual Help Association
E. S. A. Abbeyville Tutorial Program
P. O. Box 365, Abbeyville, Louisiana 70510
Tony Alvarez, Director, 318-893-6286
E. S. A. Thibodaux Youth Program
P. O. Box 646, Thibodaux, Louisiana 70301
Forest Reubin, Director, 504-447-4361

Southern University Tri-Parish Consortium
Department of Guidance, Southern University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70807
Raymond B. Floyd, Director, 504-775-6300 Ext. 581

Texans for Educational Advancement of Mexican Americans
518 West Houston Street, San Antonio, Texas 78204
Ray Sanchez, Director, 512-225-4313

Tri-County Community Center
Rankin County Community Relations Project
1036 Dalton Street, Jackson, Mississippi
Jimmy Harvey, Director, 601-352-0262

Not visited but included in the report:

Community Coalition for Public Schools
P. O. Box 3473, Jackson, Mississippi 39203
Peter Stewart, Director, 601-355-5241

Total—Appendix A—$1,349,028

APPENDIX B

ESAP Community Grant Projects Not Visited For This Report

(**Note:** The accuracy of this list is not guaranteed, as the Office of Education has never made available an official list of grantees with correct addresses and amounts.)

ALABAMA

ALABAMA COUNCIL ON HUMAN RELATIONS.....$10,000
Jerry Roden, P. O. Box 409, Auburn 36830

ALABAMA HUMAN RELATIONS (LEE COUNTY).....$50,000
Miss Nancy S. Spears, P. O. Drawer 1632, Auburn 36830

COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT BOARD OF CALHOUN AND CLEBURNE.....$35,000
Mrs. Frances W. Estell, Director, P. O. Box 1205, Anniston 36201

DANIEL PAYNE COLLEGE.....$58,500
Daniel T. Grant/Mrs. Gladys Dubose, Directors, Birmingham 35212

MILES CONSORTIUM INSTITUTE.....$56,600
Mrs. Betty Gates, 5500 Avenue 6, Fairfield 35064

NATIONAL P.T.A. $14,794
C. Watkins

PULASKI-CAVALRY REHABILITATION STUDY $44,968
Andrew Dawkins, Director, 2205 University Drive N.W., Huntsville 35805

SELMA INTER-RELIGIOUS PROJECT.....$99,123
E. Harrison, Director, P. O. Box 1587, 100 10th Street, Tuscaloosa 35401

SELMA UNIVERSITY $17,930
Rev. G. D. Horton, Director, 1501 Lapsley Street, Selma 36701

TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE $28,393
Dr. Theo Pinnock, Tuskegee 36088

WEST MACON IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION.....$15,000
Mrs. Consuello Harper, 3114 Caffey Drive, Montgomery

ARKANSAS

ARKANSAS COUNCIL ON HUMAN RELATIONS.....$83,100
Russell D. Hawkins, Director, 600 West 9th Street, Suite 210, Little Rock 72206

ARKANSAS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION $35,000
T. E. Patterson/Forrest Rozzell, 1500 W. 4th Street, Little Rock 72201

BLACK UNITED YOUTH.....$29,640
Leroy Brownlee, Century Bldg., Suite 202, Little Rock 72202

FORREST CITY COMMISSION ON HUMAN RELATIONS....$25,165
Rev. L. V. Gibson, 221 N. Rosser St., Rm. 9, Forrest City 72335

PANEL OF AMERICAN WOMEN.....$27,000
Sara Murphy, 423 Shamrock Dr., Little Rock 72205

CALIFORNIA

PASADENA URBAN LEAGUE.....$48,752
(Under National Urban League—office in New York)

COLORADO

SER $42,450
Ralph Casarez, 735 Curtis St., Denver 80204

DENVER URBAN COALITION.....$25,846
George Brown, 1711 Penn St., Denver 80202

FLORIDA

AFRO-AMERICAN CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER....$34,960
John Farmer, 520 W. State St., P. O. Box 1020, Jacksonville 32202

BETHUNE-COOKMAN INSTITUTE $81,400
William Kornegay, Director, Community Mathematics Program, Daytona Beach

BROWARD COUNTY COMMUNITY COORD. GROUP.....$43,250
c/o Broward County Community Relations Commission, 3521 West Broward Blvd., Suite 320, Ft. Lauderdale 33312

COMMUNITY ACTION MIGRANT PROGRAM.....$65,000
William H. Johnson/Eugene Gillis, 3521 W. Broward, Suite 10, Ft. Lauderdale 33312

CONCERNED PARENTS FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR BLACK YOUTH.....$30,000
Mrs. Earlene Freeney/Ray Logan, Box 2332, Eatonville 32751

FLORIDA MEMORIAL COLLEGE.....$117,915
Dr. Roscoe Webb, 15800 N.W. 42nd Ave., Miami 33054

FLORIDA TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY.....$154,879
Dr. Calvin Miller, P. O. Box 25000, Orlando 32816

FLORIDA A & M INSTITUTE.....$49,000
Paul Mohr, Box A-106, Tallahasse 32307

GAINESVILLE WOMEN FOR EQUAL RIGHTS.....$19,618
Rose Duncan, Director, P. O. Box 1256, Gainesville 32601

GOLDEN TRIANGLE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION.....$52,310
James Snelling, 2640 Central Ave., St. Petersburg 32507

LAKE COUNTY ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, INC. $20,000
Mrs. Edlyn J. Dickerson, 406 Pine St., Leesburg 32748

NATIONAL P.T.A. $14,794
C. Watkins, Chicago, Illinois

NCCJ DADE COUNTY YOUTH.....$24,960
John Glaser, P. O. Box 790, Miami 33101

PROJECT REAL $7,300
James Logan, 2056 30th St., Sarasota

SEMINOLE COMMUNITY ACTION.....$32,000
Louise Crawford, P. O. Drawer 1389, 1101 Pine Ave., Sanford 32771

SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD.....$41,300
Winfred L. Godwin, 130 Sixth St., N.W., Atlanta, Ga. 30313

THEATRE OF AFRO ARTS.....$11,250
Wendell Narcisse, P. O. Box 94 N.W. Branch, Miami 33147

WJCT COMMUNITY TV.....$113,280
Richard Brown, 2037 N. Maine St., Jacksonville 32206

GREATER JACKSONVILLE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY....$30,100
Miss Fredericka D. Tooley, c/o Jacksonville Council for Creative Curriculum, 1133 Ionia St., Jacksonville 32202

GEORGIA

ALBANY, GEORGIA NURSERY SCHOOL.....$41,823
Carole R. King, P. O. Box 1812, Albany 31702

ATHENS COUNCIL ON HUMAN RELATIONS.....$21,686
E. Paul Torrance, Box 2293, Georgia University Station, Athens 30601

ATLANTA URBAN LEAGUE.....$25,000
Lindon A. Wade, 75 Piedmont Ave., N.E., Atlanta 30313

BUTLER STREET YMCA.....$22,280
Carthur Drake, 1611 Chandler Bldg., Atlanta 30303

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.....$60,000
Thomas Delton, P. O. Box 49, Ft. Valley 31093

NEW COMMUNITIES $16,620
Cellestine Hill, 229½ S. Jackson, Albany 31701

MACON COUNCIL ON HUMAN RELATIONS..... $25,000
Aaron Cook, P. O. Box 5321, Macon 31235

QUEST $65,000
Marilyn Grayboff, 5720 Riverside Dr., N.W., Atlanta 30303

SAVANNAH STATE COLLEGE..... $110,000
Wilton Scott, State College Branch, Savannah 31404

SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD..... $47,033
Winfred Godwin, 130 Sixth St., N.W., Atlanta 30313

KENTUCKY

COMMUNITY ACTION — LEXINGTON..... $31,117
Ron Berry, 866-A Georgetown St., Lexington 40505

LOUISIANA

COMMUNITY RELATIONS COUNCIL..... $22,820
Miss Jacqueline Houston, 333 St. Charles Ave., Room 414, New Orleans

DULAC COMMUNITY CENTER..... $9,059
James Bopp, Box 1150, Dulac 70753

LOUISIANA COUNCIL ON HUMAN RELATIONS..... $48,879
Ken Baker, 7986 Scenic Hwy., Baton Rouge 70807

LOUISIANA EDUCATION ASSOCIATION..... $70,174
J. K. Haynes, 1335 North Blvd., Baton Rouge 70821

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY..... $86,911
Don Glad, Dept. of Psychology, Baton Rouge 70803

ST. LUCY'S COMMUNITY CENTER..... $6,644
Father John Lauer, P. O. Box 484, Houma 70306

SONS OF DESIRE..... $29,317
George Price, 3309 Desire Pkwy., New Orleans 70126

SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD..... $41,300
Winfred Godwin, 130 Sixth St., N.W., Atlanta, Ga. 30313

SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE (NEW ORLEANS).... $62,400
Dr. G. Leon Netterville, P. O. Box 9847, Baton Rouge 70813

URBAN LEAGUE OF GREATER NEW ORLEANS, INC..... $29,000
Clarence L. Barney, 1821 Orleans Ave., New Orleans 70113

MARYLAND

ESSEX COMMUNITY COLLEGE.....$47,004
Tom Juliano, Essex 21221

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS....$43,000
Marian Patterson, 6508 Walnut St., Temple Hill 20031

MISSISSIPPI

BEREAN BIBLE CHURCH.....$34,882
Rev. John Perkins, 309 Center St., Mendenhall 39114

CENTRAL MISSISSIPPI $37,389
Ernestine Shoemaker, P. O. Box 310, Winona 38967

GREATER JACKSON AREA COMMITTEE.....$65,476
Bill McElhannon, 223 W. Rankin St., Jackson 39202

GREENVILLE BLACK YOUTH.....$20,000
Rogers Robinson, P. O. Box 646, Greenville 38701

OXFORD DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION.....$11,945
Rev. Wayne Johnson, 411 No. 5th, Oxford 38655

PEARL RIVER DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION.....$44,007
Sullivan Lewis, P. O. Box 518, Picayune 39466

PEARL RIVER VALLEY OPPORTUNITY.....$34,226
Mrs. Patricia Crawley, 236 W. Church St., P. O. Box 188, Columbia 39429

SOPHIA SUTTON MISSION.....$35,028
Rev. James Wells, P. O. Box KK, Prentis 39474

UNITED MINISTERIAL ASSOCIATION OF LOWNDES COUNTY $23,987
Dr. E. J. Stringer, P. O. Box 146, Columbus 39701

NEW JERSEY

NEW JERSEY EDUCATIONAL CONSORTIUM.....$45,697
Herb Strayhorn, Warren Plaza West, Building A, U.S. Route 130, Hightstown 08520

NORTH CAROLINA

ASHEVILLE YMCA $24,008
Joan Dunton, 185 S. French Broad Ave., Asheville 28801

BAPTIST MINISTER AND ASSOCIATES.....$15,916
William Hayes, 700 N. Highland, Winston-Salem 27101

BARBER-SCOTIA INSTITUTE $84,830
Mable P. McLean, 145 Cabarrus Ave., Concord 28025

BI-RACIAL COMMITTEE RECREATION CENTER.....$9,584
J. M. Butterworth, Mayor, James St., Bethel 27812

CHARLOTTE P.T.A. $71,071
William Underwood, Jr., P. O. Box 149, Charlotte 28201

CHOANOKE AREA DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION.....$90,000
Mrs. Lou Liverman, P. O. Box 280, Murfreesboro 27855

CITIZENS COMMITTEE, KINSTON BOARD OF EDUCATION $30,000
James B. Borden, 1905 York St., Kinston 28501

COUNCIL ON CHURCHES.....$49,984
Carol H. Rouse, 723 W. Johnson St., Raleigh 27603

DRAMATIC PROJECT FOR BI-RACIAL HARMONY.....$3,463
S. L. Sartain, Box 513, Wadesboro 28170

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY.....$70,000
Frank G. Fuller, Greenville 27834

KITTRELL COLLEGE $98,818
James Coleman, Kittrell 27544

NATIONAL P.T.A. $14,794
Charlotte Walker, Chicago, Ill.

N. C. AFL-CIO SCHOOL ASSISTANCE PROJECT.....$78,820
Ben Ragsdale, P. O. Box 10372, Raleigh 27605

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES.....$64,870
Dalton Brooks, P. O. Box 637, Pembroke 28372

RESEARCH ADVANCEMENT PERSONALITIES.....$15,900
Cecil Butler, 5708 Harper's Ferry Rd., Winston-Salem 27106

UNITED VOTERS OF BERTIE COUNTY.....$20,000
Rev. M. M. Steele, Rt. 4, Box 17, Windsor 27983

WILMINGTON YOUTH COUNCIL.....$7,680
Mrs. Diane Meadows, City of Wilmington, Wilmington 28401

OKLAHOMA

OKLAHOMANS FOR INDIAN OPPORTUNITY.....$29,649
Bill Gover, 555 Constitution Ave., Norman 73069

PENNSYLVANIA

CUMBERLAND PERRY DAUPHIN.....$25,120
James Lewis, 1105 Herr St., Harrisburg

MILLERSVILLE STATE COLLEGE.....$27,764
Joe Blake, Millersville 17551

SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA URBAN LEAGUE.....$48,752
Columbia

COLUMBIA URBAN SERVICES CENTER.....$7,000
Rev. Marvin Lare, 1100 Taylor St., Columbia

LAURENS COUNTY C.A.P. $23,674
Carson Payne, P. O. Box 829, Laurens 29360

NAACP (BAMBERG) $50,000
Rodney Albert, P. O. Box 202, Denmark 29042

NATIONAL P.T.A. $14,794
Charlotte Watkins, Chicago, Ill.

OPERATION PUSHOUT $35,995

PENN COMMUNITY DAILY PLANET.....$5,175
John Gadson, Box A, Frogmore 29920

PENN COMMUNITY SERVICES
John Gadson, Box A, Frogmore 29920

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON FARM WORKERS..$100,000
James Williamson, P. O. Box 861, Charleston 29402

SOUTH CAROLINA ETV COMMISSION.....$44,781
Tony Grasboll, 2712 Millwood, Columbia

SOUTH CAROLINA STATE INSTITUTE.....$54,400
M. Maceo Nance, Jr., S. C. State College, Orangeburg 29115

TENNESSEE

BLACK KNIGHTS (MEMPHIS).....$30,000
Tony Thomas, P. O. Box 2642b, Memphis 38102

CONCERNED CITIZENS FOR IMPROVED SCHOOLS.....$36,581
Rev. Elmer West, 3515 Granny White Pike, Nashville 37203

FAYETTE COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE $16,000
Alice C. Cogbill, 314 Midland St., Somerville

FISK UNIVERSITY AFRO-AMERICAN CENTER.....$134,000
Tandy Tollerson, Box 873, Nashville 37202

MEMPHIS COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROJECT.....$60,000
David Cocke, 333 Linden Ave., Memphis

MEMPHIS URBAN LEAGUE.....$25,000
Herman Ewing, 546 Beale St., Memphis

TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY.....$59,907
Andrew Torrence, 3500 Centennial Blvd., Nashville

URBAN LEAGUE (NASHVILLE).....$36,100
Diana Lewis, Nashville

TEXAS

ABRAHAM LINCOLN P.T.A. $40,000
Mrs. Waldron, 1101 Taft St., Houston

C.A.P., ABILENE $10,000
Kenneth Deckard, 116 Chestnut, Abilene

GULF COAST REGIONAL TV AFFILIATE.....$14,000
Dorothy Sinclair, 4513 Cullen Blvd., Houston

HOUSTON COUNCIL ON HUMAN RELATIONS.....$21,000
Rodger Armstrong, 3505 South Main, Houston

KERA TV $30,025
Robert Wilson, 3000 Harry Hines Blvd., Dallas

LEARN $40,000
Frank Carrillo, 1306½ Broadway, Lubbock 79401

NACOGDOCHES VOTERS LEAGUE.....$119,000
Mrs. Betty White, 1703 Batt St., Nacogdoches 75961

NORTH CENTRAL YMCA.....$8,920
Terry Peal, 1330 N.W. 18th, Amarillo

PRAIRIE VIEW A & M.....$140,000
Dr. Ivory Nelson, Prairie View 77445

PRAIRIE VIEW INSTITUTE.....$40,641
Alvin I. Thomas, Prairie View 77445

TEXAS PANHANDLE C.A.P. $29,595
Argus Burnett, 1900 West Ninth St., Amarillo

WEST TEXAS EDUCATION CENTER.....$40,000
Dr. Weldon Elbert, P. O. Box 6020, Midland 79701

VIRGINIA

HAMPTON INSTITUTE $160,000
Burnett Peters, Director, Hampton 23368

RICHMOND URBAN LEAGUE.....$48,752
Mrs. Mary Read, 112 East Clay St., Richmond 23219

SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD.....$41,300
J. Anzalone, Atlanta, Ga.

OLD DOMINION INSTITUTE.....$47,300
Norfolk

VIRGINIA CONSORTIUM FOR BETTER HUMAN RELATIONS $58,768
Rev. David Ragland, Rt. 6, Box 157, Ruther Glen 22546

VIRGINIA COUNCIL ON HUMAN RELATIONS.....$50,000
Mrs. Dolores Robinson, 214 E. Clay St., Rm. 313, Richmond 23219

VIRGINIA STATE COLLEGE.....$37,858 and $58,120
Mrs. Mae Johnson, Petersburg

Total—Appendix B—$5,758,380